

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Bradley Todd,)	C/A No. 3:05-922-MBS-BD
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	OPINION AND
)	ORDER
)	
National Aeronautics and Space)	
Administration, Central Intelligence)	
Agency, and the United States of America,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff Bradley Todd, appearing pro se, is confined at a residential care facility operated by the South Carolina Department of Mental Health. Plaintiff contends that he founded a company Venus Enterprises in 1987. Plaintiff alleges that federal governmental agencies conspired to have him committed to a mental institution so that the Central Intelligence Agency could delete and misappropriate copyrights related to Plaintiff's business. He brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging a violation of his civil rights.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for a Report and Recommendation ("Report and Recommendation"). The Magistrate Judge reviewed the pro se complaint pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation on April 6, 2005, and recommended that Plaintiff's complaint be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff sent a letter to the Magistrate Judge on May 3, 2005, demanding "royalties; past, present, and future" and added that Plaintiff "want[s]

my habeus [sic] corpus, also!” Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Id. The district court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The district court is obligated to conduct a *de novo* review of every portion of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been filed. Id. However, the court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings and recommendations. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47-48 (4th Cir. 1982).

There being no objections, the court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. For the foregoing reasons, the captioned case is hereby **dismissed** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour
United States District Court

Columbia, South Carolina
November 18, 2005

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL
Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.